REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1-3, 5, 8, 15, and 18 are amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,516,427 to Keyes et al. (hereinafter "Keyes"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

I. Claims 1-7 are allowable.

As amended, claim 1 recites that a method for utilizing server-side entry points in providing diagnostics on-demand comprises calling a one of the entry points identified in the configuration file to retrieve a data file from the server computer, the data file identifying to the client computer at least one diagnostics module available to the client computer; receiving the data file from the server computer; displaying a list of the at least one diagnostics module available to the client computer identified by the data file; and in response to receiving a selection of one of the at least one available diagnostics module from the list, calling a one of the entry points identified in the configuration file to obtain authorization to download the selected one of the at least one available diagnostics module for testing a single hardware component of the client computer.

Keyes does not teach or suggest the recitations of claim 1. On the contrary, Keyes teaches that an event registration and detection routine 24 running on a peripheral device 12 recognizes a failure or anomaly in the peripheral device 12 and causes an HTTP client procedure 28 also running on the peripheral device 12 to issue an HTTP Request message to a remote diagnostic device (RDD) 34 denoting the event and requesting diagnostic assistance. Keyes further teaches that in response to receiving the HTTP Request message, an interactive diagnostic procedure 38 running on the RDD 34 responds by either 1) dispatching a Request message to the peripheral device 12 to run a diagnostic subroutine 26 resident on the peripheral device 12, 2) dispatching an executable diagnostic subroutine to be run by the peripheral device

12, or 3) asking the peripheral device 12 to try again after some time has passed. *See*, col. 4, lines 30-50.

This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Keyes fails to teach or suggest calling an entry point identified in a configuration file to retrieve a data file from the remote diagnostic device (RDD) identifying to the peripheral device at least one diagnostics module available to the peripheral device; receiving the data file from the RDD; displaying a list of the at least one diagnostics module available to the peripheral device identified by the data file; and in response to receiving a selection of one of the at least one available diagnostics module from the list, calling an entry point identified in the configuration file to obtain authorization to download the selected one of the at least one available diagnostics module for testing a single hardware component of the peripheral device. Instead, Keyes teaches that the peripheral device sends an HTTP Request message to the RDD denoting an event or anomaly in the peripheral device and requesting help, and in response, the RDD provides a diagnostic subroutine for execution by the peripheral device, without teaching or suggesting that the peripheral device receives a data file from the RDD identifying to the peripheral device at least one diagnostics module available to the peripheral device, displays a list of the at least one diagnostics module available to the peripheral device, and in response to receiving a selection of one of the at least one available diagnostics module from the list, calls an entry point identified in the configuration file to obtain authorization to download the selected one of the at least one available diagnostics module for testing a single hardware component of the peripheral device.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over Keyes. Since claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and recite further claim features, Applicants respectfully submit that Keyes does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 2-7. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

II. Claims 8-20 are allowable.

As amended, claim 8 recites that an apparatus for use in providing diagnostics on-demand comprises a server computer configured to provide one or more entry points for use by a client computer when performing diagnostics on-demand, a one of the one or more entry points providing a diagnostic control component to the client computer, the diagnostic control component operative to request from the server computer a configuration file; receive a request

at the one of the one or more entry points for providing the diagnostic control component; in response to the request, provide the diagnostic control component to the client computer; receive a request from the diagnostic control component executing on the client computer for the configuration file; and in response to the request from the diagnostic control component, provide the configuration file from the server computer to the client computer, the configuration file identifying to the client computer each of the other entry points.

Keyes does not teach or suggest the recitations of claim 8. In contrast, Keyes teaches that an event registration and detection routine 24 running on a peripheral device 12 recognizes a failure or anomaly in the peripheral device 12 and causes an HTTP client procedure 28 also running on the peripheral device 12 to issue an HTTP Request message to a remote diagnostic device (RDD) 34 denoting the event and requesting diagnostic assistance. Moreover, Keyes teaches that the controlling procedures, such as the event registration and detection routine 24 and the HTTP client procedure 28, are already loaded into a memory 20 of the peripheral device 12 or may be incorporated into a memory media device 23, illustrated in FIG. 1, for loading on the peripheral device 12 on an as-needed basis. *See*, col. 3, lines 41-45. This is not analogous to the apparatus of claim 8 because Keyes fails to teach or suggest that the remote diagnostic device (RDD) provides an entry point for use by the peripheral device when performing diagnostics on-demand that provides a diagnostic control component to the peripheral device, receives a request at the entry point for providing the diagnostic control component, and in response to the request, provides the diagnostic control component to the peripheral device. Instead, Keyes teaches that the controlling procedures are either already loaded into the memory of the peripheral device or incorporated into a memory media device for loading on the peripheral device, without teaching or suggesting that the controlling procedures are requested from and provided by the RDD to the peripheral device.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 8 is allowable over Keyes. Since claims 9-14 depend from claim 8 and recite further claim features, Applicants respectfully submit that Keyes does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 9-14. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

For reasons similar to those given above with regard to claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is also allowable over Keyes. Since claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and recite further claim features, Applicants respectfully submit that Keyes does not anticipate

Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 16-20. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the pending claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the final Office Action, and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1-20 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicants' attorney at 404.815.1900.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

Date: July 17, 2007

/Jodi L. Hartman/
Jodi L. Hartman
Reg. No. 55,251

Hope Baldauff Hartman, LLC
1720 Peachtree Street, NW
Suite 1010
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: 404.815.1900

53377
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE